

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-36 were pending. By way of the present Reply, claims 1-2 are amended and claims 4-10 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No claims are added. Claims 1-2 and 11-36 remain pending and are submitted for reconsideration. Claims 12-36 remain withdrawn.

Claim 1 was amended to include some of the subject matter of claims 4-10. Amended claim 1 recites elected subject matter. The amendments to claim 1 are supported by the specification. For example, please see at least paragraphs [0012] –[0013] and [0018] – [0022], of the application as filed. Claim 2 has been amended to conform to typical U.S. practice.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with one of Applicants' agents, Annora Bell, on November 20, 2010. During the interview, claims 1-2 and 4-12 and U.S. Published Application No. 2005/0093455 ("Tamura") were discussed. No agreement was reached.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection – Tamura

Claims 1-2 and 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamura. Claims 4-10 have been cancelled. The rejection of claims 4-10 is therefore moot.

Tamura fails to disclose, teach or suggest a vacuum tube having a reduced-pressure vessel that comprises at least a discharge gas and at least one electron "wherein the reduced-pressure vessel is a component of a device selected from the group consisting of: a vacuum tube, a fluorescent tube, a cold cathode tube, a deuterium discharge tube, an electron beam tube, an X-ray generating tube, an ultraviolet generator, and a static electricity neutralizer" as recited in claim 1.

Tamura discloses a vacuum tube which may be a metal halide lamp 1 where a "headlight apparatus for vehicles us[es] the particular metal halide lamp." (Tamura at ¶¶ 0002 and 0057-0058). Tamura, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest a reduced pressure that is a component of a device "selected from the group consisting of: a vacuum tube, a fluorescent tube, a cold cathode tube, a deuterium discharge tube, an electron beam

tube, an X-ray generating tube, an ultraviolet generator, and a static electricity neutralizer” as recited in claim 1. Thus, the rejection of claim 1 is improper.

Claims 2 and 11-12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable, therewith, for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable in addition to their respective recitations. Favorable consideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/22/2010

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072